

NWPMA Condition Survey Committee Meeting Minutes

February 12, 2002

Attendees:

Bill Whitcomb – City of Vancouver
Bob Brooks – WST2 Center
Dave Whitcher – CRAB
Derald Christensen – Measurement Research Corporation
Bud Furber – Pavement Services, Inc.
Eric Edwards – Pierce County
N. Sivaneswaran (Siva) – WSDOT Materials Lab
Newt Jackson - Nichols Consulting Engineers
Paul Sachs - Nichols Consulting Engineers
Mat Fengler – City of Tacoma

- ❖ The meeting was called to order by Bill Whitcomb at approximately 10:00 am and began with introductions by attendees
- ❖ The minutes for the last meeting held on January 8, 2002 were discussed and it was agreed that the minutes should be revised to include Derald's offer to provide to the committee a draft proposal for committee consideration. The January minutes have been revised and are included in the e-mailing along with these minutes
- ❖ Bill Whitcomb stated that the goal for the February 12, 2002 meeting was to discuss and understand Derald's proposal to the committee. (The proposal was e-mailed to all committee members prior to the meeting). It was pointed out that Derald's proposal was an MRC recommendation and not a committee recommendation. It was agreed that this would be a starting point for the committee discussions
- ❖ Derald distributed a revised Appendix A to his recommendation
- ❖ The committee agreed to work through lunch and end early so Siva could attend another meeting
- ❖ The committee discussed and agreed to change the day of the meeting from Tuesday to Thursday so Bill can attend city meeting held on Tuesdays
- ❖ Derald gave an overview of his recommendation to the committee starting with the history of pavement rating methods in Washington state
- ❖ Newt and Siva took exception to and expressed concern with Derald's use of the term WSEXT (Washington State Extended Method) and his statement that the DOT had never adopted the deduct curves used by local agencies in the

“WSEXT” method. Newt and Siva pointed out that the State and locals use separate and different methods and that it was never the intent of the DOT to adopt or sanction the methods used by the local agencies, that their needs are very different

- ❖ Newt and Siva would like to see the references to WSDOT sanction or approval of the “WSEXT” method removed from the proposal
- ❖ Bill Whitcomb and the committee agreed that it is important to present the history of rating methods in an objective way and that there is a difference of opinion and perspective on the part of the committee members on the progression of that history and the importance of respecting those differences and the contributions of all the players
- ❖ The committee acknowledged Derald’s past contributions in PMS and his efforts in the preparation of the proposal for committee consideration
- ❖ The committee discussed the concept of a “core program” that would provide commonality for all the local agencies (an old idea discussed years ago) and still allow for individual flexibility as needed
- ❖ There was discussion on the part of the committee as to the use of certain curves for various distress types and how this impacted the resulting deduct values. There was some discussion on the “fit “ of severity levels to the curves
- ❖ Derald championed the use of multiple indices as a way to provide commonality and flexibility. Derald agreed to provide to the committee a copy of his spreadsheet used to develop the chart on p.51 of Appendix A
- ❖ After Derald’s presentation there was discussion of HB 2304 and the city reporting requirement contained in that bill (copy provided with these minutes). It was determined important to consider the reporting requirements in the process of the committee developing a recommendation for the general membership
- ❖ Paul made a suggestion that the ASTM (Paver) curves be adopted for use to meet the reporting requirements (provides commonality) and the committee discussed this as well as the use of the AASHTO protocols
- ❖ No decision was made to recommend the use of the Paver as a mechanism for meeting the reporting requirements – Bill felt that the committee needs to be able to explain why the paver method was not adopted as a recommendation for a “core program”
- ❖ The committee questioned the differences between the severity levels of the WSEXT and ASTM (Paver) methods

- ❖ Severity levels were considered to be a prime concern of any recommendation made by the committee
- ❖ Some discussion of the need to change the rating manual based on the ultimate recommendation made by the committee
- ❖ Bud stated that he felt three considerations were important for any recommendation made by the committee:
 - Should be a closed-end system
 - Results should be able to predict performance of system or project
 - Results can be used to make MR&R decisions by agencies
- ❖ Whatever index is adopted needs to be in conformity with Option B of the rating manual
- ❖ The committee agreed to meet again on March 14, 2002 at the CRAB office at 10:00AM